



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,188	09/11/2003	David E. Mayhew	6257-14502	5820
35690 7590 04/14/2009 MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398				
EXAMINER				
FOUD, HICHAM B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2419				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/660,188

Applicant(s)

MAYHEW ET AL

Examiner

HICHAM B. FOUAD

Art Unit

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/26/2009

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/05/2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on 02-05-2009 has been entered and considered.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 are pending in this application.

Claims 3 and 5-12 are canceled.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 are rejected as discussed below.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 5 [0014], it is not known what the applicant means by the terms "turn credit" and "traffic class credit" because they are no fields in the header with the above terms.

In page 9 [0024] line 18, it is not known what the applicant means by the term "turn count".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 13, 21, 25 and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 13 is a duplicate claim of claim 4 since it has the same claimed subject matter which is "bit count".

Claim 21, the term "said packet field data" has no antecedent basis.

In claims 25-26, note that claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure, such as by using the term "usable". Therefore, claim language following this phrase will not be considered. It is suggested that Applicant amend this term.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thornton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the amended claims 4-5, 14-16 and 20-27 of U.S. Co-pending application 10/945,633 filed on 02/17/2009. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Claim 14 of the instant application merely changes the scope of the claim 26 of the Co-pending application 10/945,633 by changing the step of receiving data packets, of claim 26 of the Co-pending application, to means for receiving a packet. Thus, it would have been obvious to the one skill in the art at the time of the invention to know that the claimed subject matter is the same regardless of the terminology used.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 18 and 20 recites that the transmission of the packet on the second port is based on turn value and the number of ports. However, the specification as originally filed does not adequately describe the above feature. More specifically, the claims call for "turn value specifying a second port". However, the specification does not adequately disclose that. Furthermore, the specification page 8 [0020] recites that "An output port number is equal to $((\text{input_port_number} + \text{turn_value} + 1) \text{ modulo } [N.\text{sup.}2 + 1])$ ", which means that the output port is specified by turn value, input port and the number N and not only the turn value as claimed. Thus, Examiner concludes that the claimed feature indicated above is a new matter and without further teachings, one skilled in the art does not know how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted (bolded) elements are:

The claimed switch is **required to support path routing and only to forward the packet according to the path that is contained in the packet header** (see [0018]), the received/transmitted packets are **a path-routed packets** (see [0026] line 1) and the selection of the output port depends also on **the bit count which determines the backward or forward path** and not only turn value (see [0019] and [0024]) and the output port is specified as "**An output port number =**

$((\text{input_port_number} + \text{turn_value} + 1) \bmod [N.\text{sup.}2 + 1])$ (see [0020]). The above recited elements are essential and critical because the claimed switch routes the packets without the use of routing table and the destination address which are a must in routing regular packets. Therefore, the claimed switch cannot function as claimed unless it supports path routing and only to forward the packet according to the path that is contained in the packet header, the packets are a path-routed packets and the transmission of the path-routed packets depend also on the bit count and the output port is specified as "An output port number = $((\text{input_port_number} + \text{turn_value} + 1) \bmod [N.\text{sup.}2 + 1])$ ".

9. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 13-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 18 and 20 recites that the turn value specifies the second port then transmitting the packet based on turn value/header and number of ports, which is vague and indefinite because the second port is already specified to output the packets therefore it is not known why another determination is made to select the same second port again for transmission.

Claim 16 is vague and indefinite because in claim 15 (independent claim), the second port is already selected. Therefore, how is it that bit count is used to select the selected second port? Moreover, the term "said bit count" has no antecedent basis.

Claims 4, 13, 17, 19 and 21-28 are rejected because of their dependency on the rejected claim.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

When responding to this office action, applicants are advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which they think the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Applicants must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See 37C.F.R. 1.111(c). In addition, applicants are advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and pages numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist examiner in locating the appropriate paragraphs.

Art Unit: 2419

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hicham B. Foud whose telephone number is 571-270-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10-6 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hicham B Foud/
Examiner, Art Unit 2419
04/10/2009

/Salman Ahmed/
Examiner, Art Unit 2419